

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/939,151	08/24/2001	Sylvette Maisonnier	ESSR: 052US	3004
75	90 04/09/2003			
Mark B. Wilson Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P. Suite 2400			EXAMINER	
			TUCKER, PHILIP C	
600 Congress A Austin, TX 78			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
, , , , , , ,			1712	

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary	939151	MAISONNIEG- Group Art Unit		
,	Examiner	CKER 1712		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app			ess	
Period for Reply	_			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	T TO EXPIRE	MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILIN	G DATE	
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 Cl from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by def Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by 	a reply within the statutory ault, expire SIX (6) MONTH	minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered ti S from the mailing date of this communication .		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on				
This action is FINAL .				
Since this application is in condition for allowance excaccordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle,			in	
Disposition of Claims				
χ Claim(s) $24 - 54$		is/are pending in the applica	tion.	
Of the above claim(s)		is/are withdrawn from consid	is/are withdrawn from consideration.	
Claim(s)		is/are allowed.		
	is/are rejected.	is/are rejected.		
Claim(s)		is/are objected to.		
Claim(s)		are subject to restriction or e	lection	
Application Papers				
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra	wing Review, PTO-948.			
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is approv			
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra The proposed drawing correction, filed onis/are of	is approv			
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra The proposed drawing correction, filed on The drawing(s) filed on is/are of The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	is approv			
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra The proposed drawing correction, filed on The drawing(s) filed on is/are of The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	is approv			
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is approvojected to by the Examir	ner.		
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is approvolected to by the Examiror. y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 softhe priority documents.	ner. 9(a)-(d). ats have been		
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is approvolected to by the Examiror. y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 so of the priority document	9(a)-(d). ats have been		
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra The proposed drawing correction, filed on The drawing(s) filed on is/are of The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priorit All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies received. received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Nu	is approvolected to by the Examiror. y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 softhe priority document mber) International Bureau (P	ner. 9(a)-(d). nts have been CT Rule 1 7.2(a)).		
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra The proposed drawing correction, filed on The drawing(s) filed on The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priorit All Some* KNone of the CERTIFIED copies received. received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Nu received in this national stage application from the	is approvolected to by the Examiror. y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 softhe priority document mber) International Bureau (P	ner. 9(a)-(d). nts have been CT Rule 1 7.2(a)).		
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra The proposed drawing correction, filed on The drawing(s) filed on The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priorit All Some* KNone of the CERTIFIED copies received. received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Nu received in this national stage application from the *Certified copies not received: Attachment(s)	is approvolected to by the Examiror. y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 sof the priority document mber) International Bureau (P	ner. 9(a)-(d). nts have been CT Rule 1 7.2(a)).		
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra The proposed drawing correction, filed on The drawing(s) filed on Is/are of The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priorit All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies received. received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Nu received in this national stage application from the *Certified copies not received:	is approvolected to by the Examiror. y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 sof the priority document mber) International Bureau (P	ner. 9(a)-(d). Its have been CT Rule 1 7.2(a)).	, PTO-15 <i>i</i>	

Application/Control Number: 09/939151 Page 2

Art Unit: 1712

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 24-30, 33, 34, 36, 37, 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 10-25471.

JP '471 teaches a photochromic latex which comprises naphthopyran compounds which is formed using an initiator, such as a persulfate, and monomers such as methacrylates, and wherein a biphasic layer is formed. Such is used to form substrates, such as a lens, which comprises a protective coating over the latex film (see the English translation of the JP document).

Art Unit: 1712

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 24, 31, 32, 35, 37, 38, 39 and 42-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 10-25471.

JP '471 teaches a photochromic latex which comprises naphthopyran compounds which is formed using an initiator, such as a persulfate, and monomers such as methacrylates, and wherein a biphasic layer is formed (see the English translation of the JP document). JP '471 differs from the present invention in that the progressive addition of components, the specific ratio of monomers, and the size of the latex particles are not specifically disclosed. With respect to the progressive addition of components, the courts have held that the order or manner of mixing the ingredients does not constitute a patentable difference (In re Hampel 74 USPQ 171). Furthermore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to vary the amount of monomers, and the size of the latex particles in order to optimize the photochromic properties of the latex (In re Aller 103 USPQ 233, In re Rose 103 USPQ 237).

Application/Control Number: 09/939151 Page 4

Art Unit: 1712

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 24-27, 36 and 39 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of copending Application No. 09/991773. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because although 09 991773 differs by using the term primer

Application/Control Number: 09/939151 Page 5

Art Unit: 1712

instead of initiator, the method of the claims of 09/991773 uses the same components as in the present invention, and would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Tucker whose telephone number is (703) 308-0529. The examiner's normal working hours are 7:30am-4:00pm, Monday-Friday. If necessary SPE Robert Dawson may be contacted at 703-308-2340. For inquiries of a general nature call the receptionist at 703-308-0651. The group FAX no. is 703-872-9310. The **after final** fax no. Is 703-872-9311.

PCT-2776 April 3, 2003

PHILIP C. TUCKER ART UNIT 1712